



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

contention that Rousseau may well have known Lyttelton's imitation of Montesquieu is the fact that it was avowedly such an imitation and that Rousseau, even at the time of writing the *Discours*, was coming under the influence of the *Esprit des Lois* and would have been interested in the work of a disciple of Montesquieu. There is, then, no external evidence that contradicts the belief that Rousseau knew the History of the Troglodytes; the internal evidence has appeared in the course of our examination of the History and the *Discours* and favors the same conclusion. In any case I prefer to leave the minor question of Rousseau's indebtedness an open one. The real interest of the matter is the detailed evidence that it offers that Rousseau's doctrines were the merest common-places of thought, that many theories for which he has received the credit appear in the earlier work of Lyttelton, that the indebtedness of the Frenchman is possible, and that the priority of the Englishman is certain.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

## THE MIRACLE PLAY AT DUNSTABLE

Dr. Coffman<sup>1</sup> has localized the cult of Saint Catherine of Alexandria in the West during the tenth and eleventh centuries at Rouen, Normandy. After further study of this cult, I wish to offer evidence for the view that wherever in Normandy or in England especial honor was paid to Catherine it was always ultimately due to the veneration in which she was held by William the Conqueror and Henry the First of England. The central point of interest in the following discussion lies, however, in Geoffrey's selection of this saint as the subject of his Dunstable play.

The first Western monastery dedicated to Saint Catherine was built on land belonging to Goscelinus d'Arques, a member of the ducal family;<sup>2</sup> was chartered and enriched by Duke Robert the

<sup>1</sup> George Raleigh Coffman, *A New Theory Concerning the Origin of the Miracle Play*, Chicago, 1914, pp. 72-78.

<sup>2</sup> Richard II of Normandy had a son, William d'Arques, who was also Count of Talou (William de Jumièges, *Histoire des Normands*, p. 175). The charter of the Catherine Monastery at Rouen mentions certain gifts from its founder, among them estates in *Tallou*; and in some ancient

Magnificent;<sup>3</sup> and afterwards fell under the especial protection of his son William. From this point on the extension of Catherine's cult in Normandy is always traceable to William. Pommeraye (pp. 14-20) records a long list of bequests granted to the Monastery at Rouen, which are for the most part particularized as being in honor of either William or Matilda; and as other monasteries came to be founded by the ducal family and those officially connected with it, the heads of the new institutions were generally obtained from the establishment at Rouen.<sup>4</sup>

Nor did William forget his attachment to this church when he became king of England, but transferred to it and to its members large Saxon estates in Middlesex County,<sup>5</sup> and inspired his nobles to acts of similar generosity.<sup>6</sup> Yet, although he was responsible for introducing the veneration of Catherine of Alexandria into England, it was his son Henry who caused it to spread and prosper, and who became in the English mind—as William had been in the Norman—inevitably associated with the honoring of Catherine. Of all the early English references to any endowment of this saint, only three<sup>7</sup> cannot be traced directly to Henry's influence,

verses on Goscelinus's tomb, he is called "homme royal," and said to be "*allié du sang François, Semblablement du Duc de Normandie*" (François Pommeraye, "Histoire de l'Abbaye de la Tres-Sainte Trinité Dite Depuis de Sainte Catherine du Mont de Rouen," pp. 4-9, in his *Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Ouen de Rouen*, Paris, 1764). Odericus Vitalis states explicitly that *Arques* and *Talou* were interchangeable titles (*The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy*. Bohn's Library Ser., III, 382, n. 2).

<sup>3</sup> Pommeraye, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> In this way Ainart became Abbot of St. Mary-sur-Dive (Vitalis, I, 383; II, 106), and Osbern head of Corneilles (Vitalis, I, 442). William himself, when he deposed Abbot Robert of St. Evroult, substituted in his stead a monk from the Catherine Monastery (Vitalis, I, 432).

<sup>5</sup> *Domèsday Book*, I, 128 v.

<sup>6</sup> When Roger de Builly and Muriel, his wife, endowed the Priory of Blythe, they did so upon condition that it pay a certain stipulated annual sum to the Monastery of St. Catherine of Rouen for the good of King William and of Queen Matilda (Dugdale, IV, 620 ff.); and it may be interesting to note that five hundred years later a member of the Builly family, upon the consecration of the Cathedral of Lichfield, gave to it a silver image of Saint Catherine (Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, Pars I, 455 O).

<sup>7</sup> The Hospital of Sts. Nicholas, Catherine, and Thomas the Martyr of Eastbridge (Dugdale, VII, 691 f.), the St. Katherine Hospital at Bath (*id.*, VII, 774), and Flixton Nunnery in Suffolk (*id.*, VI, 593). The Eastbridge Hospital was not founded until the time of Henry III.

and, of these three, one<sup>8</sup> may with reasonable certainty be attributed to it. It was a member of his family who established the Nunnery of Polslo, commonly called the Priory of Saint Catherine,<sup>9</sup> and one of his protégés who founded Katherine Priory<sup>10</sup> outside the walls of Lincoln; and in the Hospital and Collegiate Church of St. Catherine at London this linking of Henry with Catherine in the popular imagination is clearly indicated.<sup>11</sup>

The honoring of Catherine in England appears then to have been accompanied by a desire to please Henry, or, conversely, the desire to please Henry inspired an attendant thought of Catherine; but had Geoffrey of Cenomannia reason for such a desire? A

<sup>8</sup> Flixton Nunnery. The Duke of Suffolk married the daughter of Fitz-Osbern, kinsman to William the Conqueror (Cobb, *Norman Kings*, Table iv; Stowe, *Annales*, ed. 1631, p. 2). Fitz-Osbern had placed Osbern of St. Catherine of Rouen at the head of Corneilles (Note 4); and it is significant that, besides this Nunnery, many Suffolk churches, such as that of Limpenhoe, have mural and fenestral decorations in honor of Catherine of Alexandria.

<sup>9</sup> Dugdale, iv, 425.

<sup>10</sup> Dugdale, vii, 968. This monastery was afterwards enriched by Henry II (*id.*, vi, 969, Num. 1) and by his natural brother Hammelin, Earl of Warren (R. E. G. Cole, *The Priory of St. Katherine Without Lincoln*, in the publications of the Architect. and Archæolg. Soc. for the County of Lincoln, xxvii), for the good of the souls of Henry I, and of his daughter Matilda. Henry II did not become king of England for nineteen years after the death of his grandfather. This association of Henry I with Catherine at so late a date is, therefore, really significant. Even after the Norman line had been replaced by other houses, the English kings seem to have regarded this Priory with especial favor. When James visited Lincoln in 1617 it was at Katherine House (formerly the Priory) that he lodged and upon his own request (*Report Appendix Pt. VIII, the Mss. of Lincoln, Bury-St.-Edmunds, and Gt. Grimsby Corporations, etc.*, p. 92); and I may add in passing that when the Priory was finally suppressed, its site was given to Charles Brandon, brother-in-law to King Henry VIII (Dugdale, vii, 968).

<sup>11</sup> Dugdale, vii, 694-96. Founded by Matilda, daughter to Henry I, it was protected and enriched by successive kings and queens, and made finally by law a part of the dower rights of the queen consort; failing a queen consort, it passed to the queen dowager, and failing a dowager, to the king himself. So late as 1878, this church was still a part of the queen's property, and I have found no evidence of any subsequent annulment of its charter (J. B. Nichols, *Account of the Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of Saint Katherine Near the Tower of London*, London, 1824, *passim*; Frederick Simcox Lea, *The Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of Saint Katherine Near the Tower, etc.*, London, 1878, *passim*).

reference to Matthew Paris<sup>12</sup> reminds us that the author of the Dunstable Play was called to England by Richard, Abbot of Saint Albans. Does it not seem likely then that he would, as Mr. Coffman says,<sup>13</sup> have been occupied with thoughts of that church, with its atmosphere full of recollections of the first English martyr, rather than have been endeavoring to attract the attention of a king whom he most probably had never seen? This objection is easily set aside. Even if Geoffrey had never seen Henry, sufficient ties subsisted between his birth-place and England to have made it utterly impossible for him to seek that country without the strongest inclination to attempt to win the favorable notice of its king. Cenomannia was for years bound up with the political life of William the Conqueror,<sup>14</sup> and Henry I had long been favoring its bishops and clergy. He was in fact the close personal friend of its bishop, Hildebert,<sup>15</sup> when Geoffrey was invited to England; and manifested at all times an unusual interest in Cenomannia and its people, even going so far as to appoint the dean of its Cathedral to the Archbishopric of Rouen,<sup>16</sup> a post for generations past filled

<sup>12</sup> Thos. Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, I, 72-73, Rolls Series, 28, 4; also quoted by Coffman, p. 5, n. 17.

<sup>13</sup> Coffman, pp. 74, 78 n. 19.

<sup>14</sup> When Bishop Gervaise fled from Le Mans, William received him at his Norman court, and made him afterwards Archbishop of Rheims, one of the highest church-dignities in all of France (Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, p. 306). He called William de St.-Calais, of St. Vincent-du-Mans, to the bishopric of Durham,—from which office he was afterwards raised to be Chief Justiciary of England (Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, Pars I, 704). William was also a generous contributor to the Cathedral and other religious institutions of Le Mans (Robert Latouche, *Histoire du Comté du Maine Pendant le Xe & XIe Siècle*, in Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Paris, 1910, vol. 183, pp. 146-48).

<sup>15</sup> William Rufus had deposed this prelate from the Episcopal chair of Le Mans and brought him captive to England, but Henry, upon his accession to the throne, reinstated him in his old position (Migne, 171, pp. 68-69). This intimacy was never broken as many letters from the prelate to Henry and his family indicate (Migne, 171, pp. 154, 172-77, 189-90).

<sup>16</sup> Odericus Vitalis, III, 438. Henry called this priest to officiate at the dedication of St. Albans in 1116 (Roger de Wendover, *Flowers of History*, vol. I, p. 467, Bohn's Library Series; Twysden, *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores*, ed. 1652, 502, 45. The Cenomannian was upon this occasion the only representative of a foreign monastery participating in the services (*Gesta Abbatum*, I, 71).

almost exclusively by members of the ducal family.<sup>17</sup> Geoffrey had besides a strong personal reason for being interested in Henry. When we learn that the Abbot of St. Albans had been for some years supporting the appointment of Neustrians to the gifts of his monastery, even to the detriment of that church,<sup>18</sup> and remember that the real disposition of its offices lay in the hands of the king,<sup>19</sup> it becomes practically certain, in the light of his continued and marked partiality for Le Mans, that Henry was himself responsible for Geoffrey's call to England, and that Richard was only acting as the king's agent in the matter.<sup>20</sup>

To these ties of gratitude were added those of local interests. Geoffrey had, as we know, been somewhat tardy in responding to the invitation which had been extended to him, with the result that the position offered him had been given to another, *quia non venit tempestive*,<sup>21</sup> and he had settled in Dunstable while awaiting its reversion to himself at some future date, *sibi repromissam*.<sup>22</sup> Henry had erected a splendid hunting-palace at Dunstable, and was endeavoring to build up a flourishing municipality by offering unusually liberal privileges to any who would settle there.<sup>23</sup> Here

<sup>17</sup> Mabillon, *op. cit.*, 224; Jumièges, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Pommeraye, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> *Gesta Abbatum Monast. S. Albani*, I, 71.

<sup>19</sup> Cobb, *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 199. Richard had been himself appointed to the Abbacy of St. Albans by Rufus and Henry, and this in opposition to the desires of the English clergy (*Gesta Abbatum*, I, 66).

<sup>20</sup> When this same Geoffrey was appointed Abbot of St. Albans in 1119 (Dugdale, II, 184), it was Henry's consent that was asked (*Gesta Abbatum*, I, 73), and not that of the Bishop of Lincoln, in whose see the Monastery of Albans was situated (*Gesta Abbatum*, I, 72).

<sup>21</sup> *Gesta Abbatum Monast. S. Alb.*, I, 73.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*, I, 73.

<sup>23</sup> W. H. Derbyshire, *A History of Dunstable*, 1872, pp. 23-25. The rental of an acre of land at Dunstable was only twelve pence per annum; the town had a free gallows, and its inhabitants were never required to answer before any "of the itinerant justices, or any other of the king's ministers, without the town and liberty of Dunstable; but the judges and deputies of the sovereign came down to Dunstable, and all pleas were determined by twelve jurors, sworn in from the burgesses, without the association of any stranger." At a later period, Henry founded a Priory at Dunstable, with the intention of converting it finally into a Cathedral with Dunstable as its Cathedral town; a future very glorious for any city in the mediæval mind. Although this plan was never brought to fruition, it serves to indicate the magnitude of Henry's expectations for Dunstable. According

Geoffrey lived, not, as is commonly supposed, as a teacher in a school subordinate to Saint Albans,<sup>24</sup> but as a simple citizen<sup>25</sup> of a royal town and own burgher to the king.<sup>26</sup>

The foregoing exhibit of evidence, then, clearly gives warrant for considering it natural and inevitable that Geoffrey should have desired to attract Henry's attention and to win his approbation. Not with material endowment of Catherine of Alexandria, however, did he attempt to effect his purpose. It was not unusual to strive for the favor of kings by literary productions; nor was worldly advance-

to an old record (quoted by Derbyshire, p. 54 f.), his successor, Henry VIII, proposed at one period of his life to carry out Henry's intentions concerning the Priory, and even went so far as to nominate a certain Dr. Day for its first Bishop (Luard, *Annales Monastici*, III, 15, Rolls Series 36).

<sup>24</sup> In the middle ages, all instruction in literary arts was confined to the monasteries. Since the latest date possible for the composition of Geoffrey's play is prior to 1119 (Note 20), and Dunstable Priory was not built until after June, 1131 (Luard, *Annales Monastici*, III, Pref. xxvi, n. 1), Geoffrey could not possibly have been teaching at Dunstable when he wrote his *miraculum*. This mistake, common to almost all commentators, is probably due to Bulaeus, who, in relating the origin of the Dunstable Play, says that Geoffrey composed it while teaching at St. Albans, or at least in a school belonging to it, "*certe in scholiis ejusdem*" (Quoted by Coffman, pp. 20-21). Bulaeus is, however, putting his own interpretation on the word *legit* in Matthew Paris's account, and translates it as 'taught,' whereas its real connotation is 'read.'

<sup>25</sup> The fact that Paris recounts the destruction by fire of Geoffrey's *domus*, together with all his books, serves to show us that he was not the member of any monastic school (*Gesta Abbatum*, I, 72-73); and the mention of the possession by St. Albans Monastery of a Manor of Westwick or *Goreham* (Geoffrey's last name was Gorham) clinches the argument (Dugdale, II, 253). It is fair to suppose that when Geoffrey became Abbot of St. Albans in 1119, he took his private estate with him and endowed the monastery with it.

<sup>26</sup> W. H. Derbyshire, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-45. Henry had rebuilt the town of Dunstable, and had appropriated it to himself as his own personal property, declaring its citizens to be his own especial burghers; and so late as 1459, we find Henry VI forbidding the townsmen of Dunstable to join any Lords' Companies or to wear any signe or lyvere save that of the king or of the king's eldest son, the Prince of Wales. An interesting example of the pertinacity with which the public mind associated Dunstable with the kings of England is to be found in the divorce of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Though the inhabitants of this town may have felt real sympathy with the unhappy queen, yet their allegiance was certainly felt to be necessarily the king's, and the decree in Henry's favor was read in Dunstable Priory (W. H. Derbyshire, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62).

ment an unusual reward of literary effort.<sup>27</sup> It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the author of the Dunstable Play adopted as his method of bidding for royal favor, the production of a drama at once new in kind to England—by this the more apt to arouse Beau-clerc's interest—and commemorating the passion<sup>28</sup> of a saint very dear to his heart. And this, I believe, is just what Geoffrey did. As others had sought to please Henry by enriching Catherine with gifts of land or by the erection of churches in her honor, so Geoffrey hoped to win his approbation by a wonderful new drama, a drama enacted on a scale the magnitude of which had probably never been equaled in his day.<sup>29</sup>

The effect of this play upon its royal patron<sup>30</sup> was evidently

<sup>27</sup> Shortly before 1067, Guy of Amiens composed a lengthy poem in the Latin (Petrie, *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 856), in which he heaped the most violent abuse on King Harold, accompanied by as extravagant praise of the Conqueror; and we find the worthy bishop afterwards accompanying Queen Matilda to England as her almoner (Vitalis, I, 492). William de Jumièges composed his *Histoire des Normands* with a view to winning William's favor, and Guy de Poitiers wrote his *Vie de Guillaume-le-Conquérant* (contained in Jumièges) as a tribute to King William. Both Jumièges and Poitiers are as biased in their works as was ever the old bishop.

<sup>28</sup> In support of Mr. Coffman's convincing argument as to the subject-matter of the Dunstable Play, I invite the reader to an examination of the St. Catherine Seal of Dunstable Priory (W. G. Smith, *Dunstable, Its History and Surroundings*, pp. 69-70), that of Polslo Nunnery (Dugdale, VII, 168 n. a), and of the Hospital of St. Catherine at London (J. B. Nichols, *op. cit.*, illustrations in front of page 11, and page 56 n). All of these seals portray the figure of Catherine accompanied by the wheel of martyrdom, and, in the case of the Dunstable Seal, the faces of the angels who came down from heaven to minister unto her. This is true in most instances of all Catherine seals of that time, and would certainly seem to bear out Mr. Coffman's theory that the martyrdom of Catherine was the feature of her legend most commonly represented (Coffman, p. 77).

<sup>29</sup> Mr. Coffman suggests (p. 78) that the borrowing of the copes from St. Albans for the production of the Miracle at Dunstable, would suggest the featuring in the drama of the combat of wits between the saint and the forty wise men. The number of copes which must have been used would argue,—from a study of the only miracles known to have been produced at that time, the German Hildesheim group,—that Geoffrey's drama was uncommonly ambitious, and was on a scale of magnificence well suited to the presence of a kingly witness.

<sup>30</sup> Henry is known to have passed certain periods of local and personal festivity at Kingsbury Palace (Roger de Wendover, *op. cit.*, *passim*), and



great, for we find the University of Cambridge, which Henry had re-established and was at that time endeavoring to make famous as a seat of learning,<sup>31</sup> accepting and adopting into its practice Geoffrey's *Tractatus de Sacramento*;<sup>32</sup> and we can readily imagine that Henry's recognition of Geoffrey's literary worth was responsible for this adoption. The subsequent endowment of St. Albans with the Dunstable Priory<sup>33</sup> may be taken, I think, as another evidence of the king's acknowledgment of Geoffrey's fame; and Geoffrey's provision at St. Albans, after he became its Abbot, of a bed-chamber for the queen,<sup>34</sup> is perhaps an additional indication of the relation between the author of the Dunstable Play and Henry.

Baltimore, Md.

CATHERINE B. C. THOMAS.

## WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANTS BEZIEHUNGEN ZUR DEUTSCHEN DICHTUNG

Etwa ein Jahr nach der Rückkehr von seiner ersten Reise nach Europa veröffentlichte William Cullen Bryant im *New York Mirror*<sup>1</sup> folgendes 1836 in Neuyork geschriebene Gedicht, das wohl bisher manchem Lehrer des Deutschen hiezulande unbekannt geblieben sein dürfte:

### A PRESENTIMENT<sup>2</sup>

"O father, let us hence—for hark,  
A fearful murmur shakes the air;  
The clouds are coming swift and dark;—  
What horrid shapes they wear!  
A wingèd giant sails the sky;  
Oh father, father, let us fly!"

the presumption must be that this play was produced on one of such occasions, and that the king was present at the entertainment in Dunstable.

<sup>31</sup> Thomas Fuller, *History of the University of Cambridge*, pp. 7-10.

<sup>32</sup> B. Hauréau, *Histoire Littéraire du Maine*, 1872, v, 259.

<sup>33</sup> Dugdale, II, 253.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*, 184. By this act the queen became the only woman allowed to pass the night within the walls of St. Albans.

<sup>1</sup> XIV, Nr. 42, 15. April 1837, S. 332.

<sup>2</sup> Abgedruckt III, 273 der von Parke Godwin, Bryants Schwiegersohn, besorgten sechsbändigen Ausgabe der *Life and Works of William Cullen*